



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,881	06/26/2003	Shivaram Bhat	03226.497001;P9016	7839

32615 7590 04/11/2006  
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN  
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/608,881	BHAT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on 22 February 2006.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on 22 February 2006, claims 1,2,4,9,10,11,16,17,19 and 24 are amended. Dependent claims 28 and 29 have been newly added. This office action is made final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claim 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0186238) in view of Brun et al. (European Patent Application EP1009130A1).

Referring to claim 1, Saylor et al. is directed to a system and method for managing resources, said method comprising: accessing a list of resources (" Visual Hierarchy" of resources, Saylor et al., Paragraph 0049), wherein a resource comprises an object defined by a service type (Saylor et al., Paragraph 0051 and Paragraph 0063) and wherein a resource is identifiable by a resource name (Saylor et al., Paragraph 0064);

and representing said first and second resources in a hierarchical ("logical hierarchy") reflecting said relationship (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0049-0050, 0063-0064 and 0075+).

Sylor et al. does not explicitly recite that name of a first resource and name of a second resource are compared to identify a relationship between them, wherein said relationship is based on first resource name and said second resource name. Sylor et al. also does not explicitly recite that said hierarchical organization comprises a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name, wherein said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter.

However, Brun et al., teaches a system and method of distributed directory services for locating network resources wherein name of a first resource and name of a second resource are compared (Brun et al., Column 1 Line-32-42) to identify the relationship between them (Brun et al., Column 15 Line35-57, Column 16 Line-30-50 and Column 19 Line-32 through Column 20 Line-45). Particular note that the method and system of Brun et al. is comparing "prefix" of a resource name to a with prefixes stored in an access directory name database (Brun et al., Column 1 Line-32-42). Also, Figure 9 of the specification of Brun et al. discloses matching (comparing) prefixes of a resource name to other prefixes in order to identify relationship between resource names based on first resource name and second resource name.

In addition, Brun et al. discloses that resource name is specified using three values: Resource Identifier Type, Resource Identifier, and Resource Identifier Prefix

Art Unit: 2162

(Brun et al., Brun et al., Column 15 Line35-57). In doing so, Brun et al. expressly recite that "Resource Identifier Type: this describes the addressing scheme used for this user (**E.164, X.121, NSAP, ...**)" NSAP stands for "Network Service Access Point" and is one of two types hierarchical address and is defined in ISO/IEC 8348. Said NSAP and other addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121 all employ hierarchical name systems, wherein a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name are used. Said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter (a dot).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Saylor et al. for managing resources with the system and method taught by Brun et al. for managing distributed directory services and locating network resources so that the combined system and method would compare the name of a first resource and the name of a second resource to identify their relationship based on their names and represent them in a hierarchical organization reflecting the relationship, wherein said hierarchical organization would comprise a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name, wherein said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter. One would have been motivated in order to "define a simple and effective method and system for locating a resource in large networks" (Brun et al., Column 8 Line-20-24).

Claim 9 and 16 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Referring to claim 3, the system and method taught by Saylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 1 discloses the invention as claimed. Said system and method comprises listing said resources in order according to their respective relationships ("Fishbone Hierarchy", Saylor et al., Paragraph 0137-0147+).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis claim 3.

Referring to claim 8, the system and method taught by Saylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 1 discloses the invention as claimed. In the said system and method, one of the first and second resources is identified as a sub-resource of the other (Paragraph 0076-0080).

Claim 15 and 23 are rejected on the same basis as claim 8.

Claim 4, 11, and 19 are rejected on the same basis claim 1. NSAP and other addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121, as disclosed by Brun et al., all employ hierarchical name systems, wherein a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name are used and said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter (*a dot*).

4. Claim 2, 10, 17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Ramamoorthy (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0213258).

Referring to claim 2, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 inherently receives a request identifying a resource (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0137—0147+) and locating said resource in said hierarchical organization (Sylor et al., Paragraph 0137—0147+). Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 does not explicitly teach that said system and method determines whether said resource is subject to an access policy. However, Ramamoorthy teaches a system and method for information technology management policies wherein resources are associated with access policy (Ramamoorthy, Paragraph 0018-0025+) and requestors are inherently checked for access privileges (Ramamoorthy, Paragraph 0036).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 1 with the system and method taught by Ramamoorthy for associating access policy with computing resources so that the combined system and method would receive a request for a resource, locates the resource in the resource hierarchical structure, and determines if the resource is subject to an access policy. One would have been motivated to do so simply because access to computing resources should be restricted using access policies for security concerns.

Claim 10, 17, and 24 are rejected on the same basis as claim 2.

5. Claim 5, 6, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0128615).

Referring to claim 5, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 4 above does not explicitly teaches comparing resource names comprises receiving information identifying what is used as said identifier. However, Carmel et al. teaches a system and method for indexing and querying documents wherein context delimiters are used for both indexing and querying into documents (Carmel et al., Paragraph 0041-0043 and 0047-0048).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 4 above with the system and method taught by Carmel et al. for indexing and querying into documents so that, in the combined system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information identifying what is used as the delimiter in resource names. One would have been motivated to do so simply to identify different components of the resource name.

Claim 12, 20 and 25 are rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Referring to claim 6, the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Carmel et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 5 discloses the invention as claimed. In the said system and method, comparing comprises receiving information for wildcard pattern matching of resource names (Carmel et al., Paragraph 0049).

Claim 13, 21 and 26 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.



Art Unit: 2162

6. Claim 7, 14, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Shrader et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6026440).

Referring to claim 7, the system and method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 4 above does not teach that comparing comprises receiving indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive. However, Shrader et al. teaches a system and method for web server account management wherein threshold keywords are indicated whether they are case-sensitive or not (Shrader et al., Column 9 Line-55 through Column 10 Line-20+).

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of identifying whether keywords/names are case-sensitive or not as taught by Shrader et al. to the system and method taught by Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. as applied to claim 4 above so that, in the resultant system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive or not. One would have been motivated to do so simply for better identification of resource names.

Claim 14, 22 and 27 are rejected on the same basis as claim 7.

7. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor et al. in view of Brun et al. and further in view of Ramamoorthy and further in view of Cheng et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5544322).

Art Unit: 2162

Referring to claim 28, Sylor et al. in view of Brun and further in view of Ramamoorthy does not explicitly disclose that the quest for the resource is forwarded from first policy decision point to a second policy decision point for evaluation. However, Cheng et al. teaches a method and system for policy-based authentication wherein a request for access could be referred to another policy server for evaluation (Cheng et al., Column 6 Line 65-67).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of referring requests for access to another policy server as taught by Cheng et al. to the method of Sylor et al. in view of Brun and further in view of Ramamoorthy so that, in the resultant method, the request for resource would be forwarded to another policy server (a second decision point). One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a client "an authentication path that complies with both server's policy and the client's policy (if such a path exists)" (Cheng et al. Column 2, Line 45-48).

8. Referring to claim 29, Official note is taken that the use of a cache for subsequent requests/processes is notoriously well known in the art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 14 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant alleges that Brun fails to supply what Sylor lacks. However, Brun et al., teaches a system and method of distributed directory services for locating network resources wherein name of a first resource and name of a second resource are compared (Brun et al., Column 1 Line-32-42) to identify the relationship between them (Brun et al., Column 15 Line35-57, Column 16 Line-30-50 and Column 19 Line-32 through Column 20 Line-45). Particular note that the method and system of Brun et al. is comparing "prefix" of a resource name to a with prefixes stored in an access directory name database (Brun et al., Column 1 Line-32-42). Also, Figure 9 of the specification of Brun et al. discloses matching (comparing) prefixes of a resource name to other prefixes in order to identify relationship between resource names based on first resource name and second resource name.

In addition, Brun et al. discloses that resource name is specified using three values: Resource Identifier Type, Resource Identifier, and Resource Identifier Prefix (Brun et al., Brun et al., Column 15 Line35-57). In doing so, Brun et al. expressly recite that "Resource Identifier Type: this describes the addressing scheme used for this user (**E.164, X.121, NSAP, ....**)" NSAP stands for "Network Service Access Point" and is one of two types hierarchical address and is defined in ISO/IEC 8348. Said NSAP and other addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121 all employ hierarchical name systems, wherein a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top

Art Unit: 2162

level name are used. Said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter (a dot).

Therefore, Brun does supply what Sylor lacks and the combination of Sylor and Brun fully constitutes the method of claim 1 the claimed invention. Rejection of claim 1 and dependents claims which depends to said claim 1 stands firm.

In similar fashion, Ramamoorthy supplies what Sylor in view of Brun and lacks and rejection of claim 2, 10, and 17 are withheld. Rejection of claim 4, 11, 19, and 24 stand because Brun teaches addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121, NSAP as stated above with regard to the applicant's argument for claim 1. The result of the claims not particularly addressed stand rejected either other ground of their dependency or in view of pertinent prior art.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined four references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

Art Unit: 2162

reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

### **Conclusion**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint

AU-2162

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100